

Manuscripts and Scholia: Some Textual Problems

M. van der Valk

THE DIRECT TRADITION of an author (the MSS.) and the indirect tradition (lexicographers, scholia, authors who quote a passage in question) do not, as is well known, always agree with one another. I examine here some passages of various authors that illustrate the problem, and on which some progress might be made.

We may begin with Lycophron *Alex.* 1309. The latest editor¹ prints δευτέρους ἔπεμψαν Ἄτρακας λύκους, whereas the MSS. of Lycophron offer ἄρπαγας λύκους. The reading Ἄτρακας, which I agree is the authentic text, is only to be found in Stephanus of Byzantium, and it was known in turn to Eustathius:² κὰν ἀντὶ τοῦ “Ἄτρακας λύκους,” ὃ γράφει ὁ Ἐθνικολόγος [Stephanus] “ἄρπαγας λύκους” γράφωσι τὰ τῶν ἀντιγράφων κοινότερα. On geographical questions Eustathius nearly always made use of Stephanus. Thus here in his commentary on the Catalogue of *Iliad* 2, in mentioning Atrax he was acquainted with the fact that the special reading of the text of Lycophron occurred in that author. Since, however, Lycophron was among Eustathius' favourite authors, the commentator also knew the different text that was to be found in the MSS. of Lycophron.³ Neither Tzetzes⁴ nor the scholia to Lycophron, which do not present any notice on 1309, were acquainted with the authentic Ἄτρακας. This reading is quite consistent with the mentality of Lycophron, whose predilection was for refined and obscure allusions that tended to show his erudition. So here he mentions a Thessalian town, Atrax, which was relatively obscure, in order to indicate the Argonauts, whose leader Jason was a Thessalian. The ancient critics, however, were inclined to take offence at the smallest discrepancies which they thought to

¹ L. Mascialino, *Lycophronis Alexandra* (Leipzig 1964).

² *Il.* 337.16f (I 527.11–13 van der Valk).

³ The term κοινότερα used by Eustathius is misleading, for by it he indicates the vulgar, more common MSS. of Lycophron and gives the impression that he knew other and perhaps better MSS. presenting Ἄτρακας. I am convinced, however, that at this late Byzantine epoch no such MSS. existed and that Eustathius does not speak from personal experience.

⁴ Cf. E. Scheer, *Lycophronis Alexandra* II (Berlin 1908) 369.

detect in authors.⁵ In fact the crew of the Argo consisted not only of Thessalians, but of heroes from all the regions of Greece. For this reason, I suggest, the critics were moved to alter the text. Because they had to replace it by a metrically equivalent word, they had recourse to the conjecture ἄρπαγας, for, as Apollonius Rhodius relates, the Argonauts made use of ruses in order to acquire the golden fleece. This time the conjecture was successful, for it was taken over by the leading mss. or presented by the editor of the ms. from which the Byzantine minuscule mss. derived.

An instance that is quite similar is presented by Xenophon *Lac.* 3.5, praising the Spartan youth for their modesty: αἰδημονεστέρους δ' ἂν αὐτοὺς ἠγήσαιο καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς θαλάμοις παρθένων. This text is completely satisfactory. However, Ps.-Longinus *Subl.* 4.4 presents a different text, which is also found in Stobaeus: τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς παρθένων; this version has been accepted by the editors⁶ and by Renehan.⁷ Now the following arguments can be adduced in defence of this text. (a) It is attested by two ancient witnesses who are independent of each other, Ps.-Longinus and Stobaeus (b) Ps.-Longinus found this reading in his ms. or edition of Xenophon and did not present it of his own accord, for it is evident that he took offence at the expression. (c) The expression τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς παρθένων—in Greek the pupil of the eye is called κόρη—is artificial and sophisticated; one is reminded of the metaphors that Gorgias liked to display. We must not forget that Xenophon was a soldier who for the greater part of his life lived outside of Athens, and so in all likelihood was not a great expert on Attic style. It stands to reason that such authors sometimes attempt an expression which to their inexperienced ears seems refined, but which in reality is ridiculous. Nor is this the only passage in this tract where Xenophon exerts himself to find expressions that are more noticeable than the ordinary and more pompous.⁸ So it is obvious that the text of our mss. is incorrect, and that we are confronted again with a deliberate alter-

⁵ Cf. e.g. M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden 1964–65) II 1–222, where I have collected a number of instances illustrating this fact.

⁶ F. Ruehl, *Xenophon Scripta minora* (Leipzig 1911); E. Marchant, *Xenophon V* (Oxford 1920). D. A. Russell, 'Longinus' *On the Sublime* (Oxford 1964) 78, does not offer a definite view on the authentic text.

⁷ R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1969) 24–26. In the explanation of the facts my interpretation differs from his (see *infra*).

⁸ Thus he says that the Spartan young men are so modest and silent that they even surpass stone statues, and that their eyes are more immovable than those of bronze monuments (*Lac.* 2.3.4f).

ation.⁹ The ancient critic, quite like Ps.-Longinus, took offence at the extravagant image and removed that objectionable expression because he wished to purge the author he admired from the blame of *κακοζηλία*.¹⁰ We see also that Xenophon tried to embellish his text by using an image after the style of Gorgias, a style which by that time was already a little antiquated. The alteration was taken over or made by the editor of the ms. from which the Byzantine mss. derived.

A difficult case, on which I have long been in doubt, is the choice to be made at Hesiod *Op.* 344. Hesiod praises the aid offered by neighbours, which is often more effective than that of parents: *εἰ γὰρ τοι καὶ χρῆμ' ἐγχώριον* (or *ἐγκώμιον*) *ἄλλο γένηται*. The reading *ἐγχώριον* occurs in the mss. of Hesiod, in *Et.Gud.*, and in the Commentary of Tzetzes on Hesiod, whereas *ἐγκώμιον* is offered or presupposed by the scholia vetera of Hesiod,¹¹ by Steph. Byz. 401.1f Meineke, and by Pap. 19 (first century A.D.).¹² After having carefully sifted the evidence I believe that *ἐγκώμιον* represents the authentic text. (a) It is presented by three independent witnesses (the scholia vetera [= Proclus], Stephanus, and a papyrus of the first century). (b) Of the four explanations offered in the scholia vetera, three do not connect the word *ἐγκώμιος* with *κώμη*, which is the only logical interpretation, but rather, by a forced explanation, with *χωρίον* or *οἶκος*.¹³ I believe it is practically certain that Proclus did not invent

⁹ Renehan (*supra* n.7) wrongly thinks that we have here a corruption of the text and says that even if deliberate, it had been made by someone "who did not understand the passage."

¹⁰ As for the young girl described here, one may compare the young girl mentioned in Hes. *Op.* 519–21.

¹¹ A. Pertusi, *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies* (Milan 1955) 115f, on *Op.* 344–45 and 344a.

¹² *ἐγχώριον* has been accepted by M. L. West, *Hesiod, Works and Days* (Oxford 1980) 243, and by A. Rzach. On the other hand, *ἐγκώμιον* is presented by F. Solmsen, *Hesiodi Opera* (Oxford 1970).

¹³ Cf. Pertusi 116.4–7: (1) ἡ διὰ τῶν χωμάτων ἃ περιέβαλλον ταῖς οἰκήσεσιν (thus *ἐγκώμιον* ~ *χωμα*, κ=χ). (2) ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ διατρίβειν ἔξω τῶν οἰκήσεων ἔνεκα τῶν ἔργων (= *κώμη*, a curious and forced explanation). (3) <ἡ> διὰ τὸ ἀναπαύεσθαι καὶ κοιμᾶσθαι καὶ τὰς οἰκήσεις ποιέσθαι (thus *ἐγκώμιον* ~ *κοιμᾶσθαι*). I have supplemented ἡ because we are confronted with a third explanation: something which occurs in the house, in which one is accustomed to sleep. As to the scholium itself: (a) *παρρησία* (Pertusi 116.20) means 'freedom of action' and may be added to the testimonies offered by LSJ s.v. 3. (b) The diction of the scholiast—a fact which is more than once to be seen in scholiasts, cf. M. van der Valk, *REG* 83 (1970) 494–96 and *AniCl* 40 (1971) 6f—is inelegant and loose. I refer to Pertusi 116.14f: ὡς (τὸν add. Pertusi) ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐξιόντα δεόμενον τοῦ μὴ ἐμποδίζειν τὸν χιτῶνα. One would have expected the genitive absolute, ὡς τοῦ ἐξιόντος δεομένου.

these four explanations on his own account, but made use of older commentaries.¹⁴ Accordingly, more than one older commentary proceeded from the reading *ἐγκώμιος*. (c) The word *ἐγκώμιος* in the meaning 'in the village' is rare.¹⁵ We should note also Callimachus fr.384.49 Pf., where the word *ἐπίκωμος* occurs. In his commentary (I 318) Pfeiffer observes, "Prob. Callimachus in textu Hesiodi *ἐγκώμιον* (non *ἐγχώριον*) legit." It is well known that Callimachus especially liked to use or allude to rare words that occurred in Homer and Hesiod. I would argue, therefore, that the word *ἐγκώμιος*, rare in this meaning, was apparently for this reason replaced by the common word *ἐγχώριος*. This alteration found its way into the edition or ms. which formed the basis of the Byzantine mss. of Hesiod.¹⁶

In Hesiod *Op.* 288 the mss. and scholia read *ὀλίγη μὲν ὁδός*, whereas the indirect tradition represented by Plato and Xenophon presents *λείη μὲν ὁδός*,¹⁷ which has been accepted by all modern critics. Indeed we can only accept it as the authentic text.¹⁸ The decision is difficult, because unlike the passage of Hesiod just discussed, not only the mss. but also the scholia vetera present *ὀλίγη*.¹⁹ Moreover, we can hardly assume that *ὀλίγη* has been caused by a corruption in the text, which solution would have facilitated matters.²⁰ To the contrary, we must admit here that we have a deliberate alteration. Critics, by means of a conjecture, often try to improve the text or to make it more elegant; yet here the correct reading *λείη* is the more elegant and attractive one.²¹ Nevertheless, I must conclude that even though Proclus already

¹⁴ The scholiasts often made use of three older commentaries, as the scholia to Homer and to Aristophanes show.

¹⁵ LSJ s.v. I adduce only our passage.

¹⁶ The testimony of Tzetzes, who offered *ἐγχώριος*, has no weight, for he followed the Byzantine vulgate. Likewise *Et.Gen.*, like *Et.Gud.*, may have followed the Byzantine tradition.

¹⁷ This reading is also offered by Plutarch, Stobaeus, and Aristides Quintilianus. It seems, however, that they followed the text of Plato, and so their testimony has no independent authority.

¹⁸ In *Researches* (*supra* n.5) II 307–10 I wrongly took the view that the text of the mss. of Hesiod is the correct one.

¹⁹ 97.15 Pertusi. But unlike the word *ἐγκώμιος* of *Op.* 344, *ὀλίγη* did not offer any difficulties, and so Proclus did not need to consult and adduce older commentaries, in which case he might have had the opportunity to come across the correct text.

²⁰ From a palaeographical point of view it is unlikely that *λείη* was corrupted into *ὀλίγη*.

²¹ West (*supra* n.12) 230 says in defence of *λείη* that it avoids the tautology of *ὀλίγη* . . . *μάλα δ' ἐγγύθε*. This argument, however, is not convincing, because the *parallelismus membrorum* is precisely characteristic of archaic poetry. In this passage of Hesiod, *ὁδός* 'the road' and *ὄμιος* 'the path' are pointedly contrasted.

knew only the incorrect text, the testimony of two independent and ancient witnesses, Plato and Xenophon, decides the question.

In Plato *Symp.* 173D the judgement about the correct text is not so difficult as in the two preceding passages, but it is nevertheless interesting. Apollodorus, Socrates' well-known friend and disciple, is addressed by the interlocutor: *ὀπόθεν ποτέ ταύτην τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔλαβες τὸ “μαλακός”* (or “*μανικός*”) *καλείσθαι. μαλακός* occurs in the majority of the mss., whereas *μανικός* is to be found in T² and W².²² Here the arguments for a solution are incontrovertible. *μαλακός*, as de Vries rightly proposes, represents the authentic text. (a) The word also occurs elsewhere as an epithet of persons who are characterised in this way,²³ a fact which is understandable, because the epithet was applied to indicate homosexuals,²⁴ who were often ridiculed in Athens, as is best seen in Aristophanes' comedies. (b) *μανικός* can be explained very well as a subjective conjecture, for it is well known (*cf.* especially Plato's *Phaedo*) that Apollodorus was an unusual character, especially liable to passionate outbursts. So the epithet *μανικός* was not entirely inappropriate in these circumstances. Besides, it was more seemly, for *μαλακός* is not a very flattering epithet for an intimate member of the Socratic circle. Ancient critics often took exception to portraits or words that seemed to them unbecoming.²⁵ So we can understand why they ousted *μαλακός*. Finally, it is difficult to imagine that *μαλακός* might have been a conjecture and alteration of the authentic text, for Apollodorus' peculiarities were of course familiar only to his contemporaries. So in this instance the text of the majority of the mss. is entirely right. The passage is not without interest, however, for it shows that Plato apparently took a kind of malicious pleasure in alluding to a weakness of a member of the circle to which he belonged himself.²⁶

²² J. Moore, *Mnemosyne* IV.22 (1969) 225–30 accepts *μανικός*, whereas J. de Vries, *Mnemosyne*, 230–32, prefers *μαλακός*.

²³ *Cf.* *P.Hib.* I 54.11, where a musician is called *ὁ μαλακός*; see also W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, s.v. *μαλακός*, where another testimony is presented.

²⁴ For this meaning see LSJ s.v. III.2.1. I may add Diog. Laert. 6.61: Diogenes sees two *μαλακοί*, who wish to avoid him, and says *κύων τευτλία οὐ τρώγει*. I think that *τευτλίον* here denotes the *membrum virile*. This meaning is not mentioned by LSJ or the Supplement.

²⁵ On this point see e.g. Valk (*supra* n.5) II 11–13.

²⁶ De Vries (*supra* n.22) 232 thinks that we have here a kind of “self-irony” on the side of Plato. In view of our observations I do not think that he is right. Wilamowitz, *Platon* I (Berlin 1920) 359, says, “Platon wollte doch seiner Treue ein Denkmal setzen.” Because of the malicious epithet attributed to Apollodorus, I do not think he is

At Sophocles *Ajax* 221f, Tecmessa has just informed the chorus about Ajax's lamentable state. The chorus, much moved, say: οἶαν ἐδήλωσας ἀνδρὸς αἴθονος ἀγγελίαν. The reading αἴθονος is to be found in part of the mss. and has been accepted by the editors (Dain, Pearson, Dawe). A variant αἴθοπος exists, however, which is presented by A and occurs as a correction in L (*supra lineam*).²⁷ More interesting still is the fact that this reading is also presupposed by the scholia of Sophocles and by the lexicographical tradition: Suidas AI 133 (Adler II 165), Hesychius A 1877 Latte. It must be admitted that the testimony of Suidas has apparently no independent value, because he mostly reproduces the scholia of Sophocles. On the other hand, Hesychius (αἴθοπος· διαπύρου, μέλανος) has not used the same source as Suidas. And in his lemma he apparently has in mind the passage of Sophocles, for like *Aj.* 221f he presents the genitive, while his interpretation διαπύρου completely suits that passage and is also to be found in the scholia *ad loc.*

We must therefore look at the respective versions of the scholium to Sophocles and of Suidas. The scholium: αἴθοπος· διαπύρου, θερμὸν ἐν ταῖς μάχαις ἢ τὸ θερμὸν νῦν ἐπὶ τοῦ παρακεκνηκότος κείσθω. Suidas: αἴθοπος· διαπύρου, θερμὸν ἐν ταῖς μάχαις, ὃ δὲ Σοφοκλῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ παρακεκνηκότος ἐχρήσατο; he then quotes the line of *Ajax*. Hence one might think that Suidas has consulted some other source than the scholia of Sophocles (*cf.* his words ὃ δὲ Σοφοκλῆς κτλ.). However, the interpretation διαπύρου . . . μάχαις, which Suidas cites first and which he does not attribute to Sophocles, precisely occurs in the scholia of Sophocles. The fact can be explained. The scholiast to Sophocles offered two interpretations but did not say that he preferred one of them, whereas Suidas selected the second, and therefore attributed it to Sophocles. Now Suidas likes to give the impression of a learned scholar and affects to have consulted more than one source, a pose often seen in Byzantine scholars.²⁸ Moreover, the majority of Sophocles mss. as well as Eustathius (357.14 [I 560.12 Valk]) offer the reading αἴθωνος, which is metrically impossible.

As for the text of Sophocles, we are capable of a definite conclusion. The correct reading is αἴθοπος. In its defence: (a) This reading

right either. Recall Ath. 507c, that Plato behaved like a stepmother with regard to Socrates' disciples.

²⁷ On this variant see also J. C. Kamerbeek, *The Plays of Sophocles I The Ajax* (Leiden 1953) 64f. Kamerbeek discusses the two variants but offers no decision about which he considers to be the authentic one.

²⁸ See M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii ad Iliadem pertinentes I* (Leiden 1971) xlviii, where I have discussed this trait with regard to Eustathius.

is supported by a great part of the ancient testimonies (the scholia, the lexicographer Hesychius, part of the mss.). (b) The reading *αἴθωνος* is surprising, for the regular genitive is *αἴθωνος*, which is presented by some of the mss. but is metrically impossible. (c) *αἴθοπος* used in a sense which suits the context of Sophocles is rare and at first sight obscure. Yet Sophocles clearly had a preference for embellishing his poetry with uncommon words or words whose meaning differed from common usage. Given the state to which Ajax is now reduced, one can understand that the chorus, who are of course very cautious, try to describe his lamentable condition by a term that is rather neutral. Therefore they wish to suggest a man who is passionate, fiery, a designation which might in fact be euphemistically applied to Ajax. In these circumstances the word *αἴθων* is very fitting.²⁹ However, the current genitive of the word was *αἴθωνος*, which would not fit the metre. In these circumstances, two paths were open to Sophocles. He could write *αἴθωνος*, which however would be a forced proceeding; or, as was easier, he could use a virtual synonym, *αἴθοπος*, and this he did.

As we have seen, the ancient scholia also presented the interpretation *παρακεκινηκότος*. This we can understand, for in fact Ajax had killed sheep instead of enemies, and this is the act of a madman. However, this interpretation is incorrect, because the chorus, made up of sailors of Ajax, had to express themselves in a very cautious manner; thus at *Aj.* 230 the chorus say of Ajax *παραπληκτῶ χερὶ συγκατακτὰς κτλ.* Here the chorus had in fact to allude to the madness of Ajax, but Sophocles deliberately attributed the fatal epithet to the hand of Ajax and not to the hero himself; thus he extenuates the dishonourable fact.³⁰

In Sophocles *Ajax* 714 the chorus say *πάνθ' ὁ μέγας χρόνος μαραίνει τε καὶ φλέγει*. This text occurs in all the mss. and is also presented by Suidas Φ 525. The editors omit the words *τε καὶ φλέγει* because they disrupt the metrical correspondence of strophe and antistrophe.³¹ The words are also missing in a quotation of the passage by Stobaeus (*Ecl.Phys.* 1.8–24 [I 97 Wachsmuth]). Nevertheless, there

²⁹ The word is used of combatants (*cf.* Aesch. *Sept.* 448, Eur. *Rhes.* 122). Note that the word also occurs in an unfavourable sense, Soph. *Aj.* 1088 *αἴθων ὑβριστής*. As to the image, Ajax, like his Homeric model Achilles, is fiery in combat but also in his passions.

³⁰ Consequently two datives occur in the phrase, *παραπληκτῶ χερὶ* and *κλεινοῖς ξίφεσιν*, a fact which must be noted but which reflects the circumstances.

³¹ The words are deleted by Pearson, Jebb, Masquerai, Dain/Mazon, and Dawe. Kamerbeek (*supra* n.27) 150f (see also viii) is inclined to retain them.

are good reasons to accept the words as authentic. (a) Stobaeus' explicit testimony cannot be dismissed out of hand. Nevertheless, his testimony is not so telling as it seems. One must not forget that Stobaeus presents an anthology of maxims that have a general and well-known significance and point. The notion of the overpowering influence of time, which destroys everything (*πάντα μαραίνει*), is of course very popular, and is found in maxims coined by many nations. On the other hand, the idea of time generating or causing everything is not familiar, at least as a maxim. So one may understand that Stobaeus omitted this idea and put to use in his anthology the more familiar sentiment. (b) If we assume the words *τε καὶ φλέγει* to have been interpolated, we are forced to ask ourselves what may have prompted the interpolator to supply the word *φλέγει*. Since in classical Greek *μαραίνω* has the meaning 'waste, wither, diminish', we may presuppose the interpolator to have interpreted *χρόνος μαραίνει* as "time ruins everything." Accordingly we might have expected him to use in the interpolation a word that indicated the opposite, such as *αὔξει*, *αἴρει*, *μεγαλύνει*. If however we attribute the words in question to Sophocles, the situation can be explained very well. In Homer, in the two places where it occurs³² *μαραίνειν* has the unambiguous meaning 'to extinguish a fire' and could not be misinterpreted by Sophocles.³³ Accordingly, by adopting the word *φλέγειν* the poet forms a very suitable contrast with *μαραίνειν*, and moreover has the chorus make unconsciously an ambiguous statement. For as far as Ajax's anger is concerned, the chorus think that the stage of *μαραίνειν* has set in, whereas in reality the state of *φλέγειν* is still appropriate to express Ajax's frame of mind. Since this explanation seems to me inevitable, the most probable solution, as already G. Hermann and C. A. Lobeck have suggested, is that a few words have disappeared in the strophe.

An interesting problem occurs at the beginning of the *Iliad*. At 1.4f the mss. read *αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι*, whereas Zenodotus offered *οἰωνοῖσί τε δαῖτα*. Zenodotus' text was accepted by distinguished scholars of the previous generation (Wilamowitz, Pasquali, Nauck, Cauer),³⁴ and in our time by Pfeif-

³² *Il.* 9.212 and 23.228. Kamerbeek (*supra* n.27) has also called attention to the Homeric usage.

³³ That Sophocles did sometimes misinterpret Homeric words see Valk (*supra* n.5) I 251–55.

³⁴ Cited in Valk (*supra* n.5) II 66 n.287. K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Berlin 1977), does not discuss Zenodotus' reading here. The text of the Homeric mss. has been defended by Ludwig, Roemer, von der Mühl.

fer.³⁵ These scholars have especially relied on passages of the Attic tragedians which they hold to support Zenodotus' reading (*cf.* Pfeiffer). I am convinced, however, that only one of the passages adduced, Aeschylus *Supp.* 800f, can be seriously considered, whereas the other instances are useless.³⁶ We may note also Sophocles *Ai.* 830, *ρίφθῶ κυσὶν πρόβλητος οἰωνοῖς θ' ἔλωρ*: as in the ms. text of *Iliad* 1.4f, *ἔλωρ* belongs to *οἰωνοί*.³⁷ But let us examine the Aeschylean passage (*Supp.* 800f): *κυσὶν δ' ἔπειθ' ἔλωρα κάπιχωρίους ὄρνισι δείπνον οὐκ ἀναίνομαι πέλειν*. In fact it might be thought that this text is in agreement with Zenodotus' Homeric text, *ἐλώρια . . . δαῖτα*, and thus Aeschylus will have presented a kind of paraphrase or echo of the Homeric text as preserved by Zenodotus. In Aeschylus, however, we are confronted with a choral song, a kind of poetry whose style is solemn and elevated. And accordingly in the passage in question Aeschylus likes to present one and the same idea by means of two related images. Thus at 779–83 the chorus, overwhelmed by sorrow, pray for some escape. To this end they make use of two images, wishing to disappear like smoke or to become invisible like dust. So the words *κάπνος* and *κόνις* are used to express the same idea. The same trait can be seen in 792–99, where the chorus, who want to avoid marriage at all costs, again express the sentiment through two related images: they wish to be carried off into the infinite heights or to be thrown into unfathomable depths. Keeping in mind these two passages that lead up to the lines in question, we can understand that in 800f as well the poet applies two images, the prey of the dogs and the dinner of the birds. In fact it is obvious that Aeschylus has in mind the famous Homeric passage of the proem of the *Iliad*: only he has transposed it into the solemn language of tragedy that is especially characteristic of its choral songs. We must remember too that to Aeschylus—in this unlike modern man—the sight of corpses being devoured by animals will not have been unfamiliar, and so he will have been aware that dogs are accustomed to

³⁵ R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 111f. Pfeiffer was not acquainted with my defence of the Homeric passage (which was published in 1964)—understandably: *ἀργαλέον μὲν ἔστι πάντ' ἐπίστασθαι*.

³⁶ For Eur. *Ion* 504f, adduced by Pfeiffer, I refer to my discussion (*supra* n.5: II 66). The testimony of Soph. *Ant.* 29f is based on an alteration of the text, made by Fraenkel (*MusHelv* 17 [1960] 238f) and accepted by Pfeiffer; I do not think, however, that the alteration is attractive, let alone convincing. Fraenkel combined 29f into one line, arguing that they are too verbose for a commander like Kreon who is "sachgemäss." This approach is arbitrary. On the contrary, one must not forget that Sophocles' style and diction are usually solemn and elaborate.

³⁷ Pfeiffer (*supra* n.35) 111 n.3 dismissed this testimony with an *ipse dixit*: "Sophocles *Ai.* 830 is not to the point."

trail their prey, whereas birds of prey remain on the spot and devour the carrion as if it were a dinner.

To return to the Homeric passage, how is Zenodotus' reading to be explained? Elsewhere I have collected and discussed a number of instances to show that Zenodotus' Homeric readings are mostly conjectures.³⁸ Now in fact Zenodotus athetised *Iliad* 1.4f.³⁹ I may observe here that especially the beginning of a book or poem is apt to attract the attention of the critics. Now in the opening of the *Iliad* one is confronted at once with the harsh and primitive ways of that age: according to 1.4f the corpses of the fallen soldiers have not been interred. I cannot believe that such a portrait, which one can expect of early times, should be inauthentic.⁴⁰ One should ask what reason prompted Zenodotus to athetise the passage. (a) He will have paid attention to *Il.* 7.327ff, which says expressly that the Greeks and Trojans buried their dead. (b) The Alexandrians of the age of Zenodotus were more civilized on this score. Only the corpses of criminals and those who had been condemned to death⁴¹ were not buried, which custom prevailed till the seventeenth century A.D. I suggest that Zenodotus took offence on this point, especially because it occurred at the very beginning of the great poem which was to the Alexandrians a much-admired model.⁴² One must not forget that the Alexandrian poets like Callimachus preferred a style that was brief, pointed, and elegant.⁴³ Zenodotus was approximately a contemporary of Callimachus⁴⁴ and both lived in the same surroundings, because

³⁸ Cf. Valk (*supra* n.5) II chapter 10. I am therefore disappointed by Pfeiffer (*supra* n.35) 287, who says that my skepticism about the Alexandrians' attitude to texts "must unfortunately be regarded as a preconceived idea, and not as a result of historical inquiries." If Professor Pfeiffer had consulted my 1964 work, he would have seen my "historical inquiries." I may refer to Erbse, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 532f: "In der Tat kann der Verfasser [van der Valk] an der Hand des fast erdrückenden Materials seine These wahrscheinlich machen." However, I also refer the reader to the conscientious study of Professor Nickau (*supra* n.34), who often presents a different view (on which see *infra*); Nickau has especially studied the atheteses of Zenodotus.

³⁹ In *Researches* (*supra* n.5) II 20 I rejected this athetesis. I am well aware that Nickau (*supra* n.34) 201 disagrees: on his arguments see *infra*.

⁴⁰ The idea that corpses are not buried occurs now and again in the Hebrew prophets, in conditions where we are also confronted with primitive manners.

⁴¹ Thus the body of King Cleomenes was crucified in Alexandria after his death and remained in this state: Plut. *Cleom.* 38f.

⁴² Nickau (*supra* n.34) 200ff has disputed the argument I used in *Researches* (*supra* n.5) II 20. For this reason I have adduced an additional argument. At any rate I do not think "dass die Verse in Altertum *problematisch* erschienen, weil der Inhalt der *Διὸς βουλή* umstritten war" (thus Nickau).

⁴³ See e.g. Callim. fr.1.17ff Pf., *αὐθι δὲ τέχνη κρύβετε μὴ σχοίνω Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην*.

⁴⁴ Cf. A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*³ (Bern 1971) 790f.

they were intimately connected with the Alexandrian library. So one can understand that Zenodotus, by athetising 1.4f—lines to which, as I have argued, he took exception—wished to make the beginning of the *Iliad* more pointed and acceptable to the Alexandrian public. The same explanation can be offered with regard to the reading οἰωνοῖσί τε δαίτα. Clearly this is more elegant than οἰωνοῖσί τε πάσι. I do not wish to deny that Homer may have already made use of some rhetorical devices,⁴⁵ such as the *chiasmus membrorum* which is to be found in the poet.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, it is well known that Alexandrian poetry is far more artificial and aims at effect. On the other hand, Homer's poetry is simpler, and the poet often makes use of synonymous words which are placed one after another in order to evoke a situation.⁴⁷ Therefore, I conclude that Zenodotus felt entitled to pay special attention to the proem of the *Iliad*. By removing 1.4f he felt he could make it more pointed; and if these lines were retained, he could by means of the light correction of only one word make the style more polished and refined, for an even more interesting line was thus created, in which two substantives were contrasted and were made more prominent.

PAPENDRECHT, THE NETHERLANDS
September, 1983

⁴⁵ Afterwards the Homeric scholiasts and commentators like Eustathius attributed to Homer the origin of nearly all rhetorical devices, cf. Valk (*supra* n.28) II li-lxx.

⁴⁶ Cf. *Il.* 1.500f, 3.103f, 4.450f = 7.64f.

⁴⁷ See e.g. the well-known expression κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν, and with regard to ἐλώριον cf. *Il.* 5.488, *Od.* 5.473 ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι.